



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/061,492	01/31/2002	Shen Buswell	10011880-1	2065

7590 11-03/2004  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CULBERT, ROBERTS P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1763	

1763

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

<b>Application No.</b> 10/061,492	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BUSWELL ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b> Roberts Culbert	<b>Art Unit</b> 1763	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

- 1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
- 2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

- 3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 5.  The a)  affidavit, b)  exhibit, or c)  request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- 6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- 7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)  will not be entered or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 43 and 46-48.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

- 8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a)  approved or b)  disapproved by the Examiner.
- 9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argument's are not persuasive to overcome the rejections.

Applicant has argued that there is no motivation to combine Brouillette and Allen because Brouillette discloses that "chips flexed in bending such that the active face and diced edges are placed in tension show large strengths with little variability while those flexed such that the non-active face and diced edges are placed in tension show small strengths with large variability." These problems relate to cuts that separate portions of a semiconductor die from each other. There is no indication in Allen or Brouillette that such flexing occurs when slot is formed through a substrate as disclosed in Allen.

The argument is not persuasive because the flexing and tension described by Brouillette does not occur during the cutting operation as implied by applicant. Brouillette is describing the strength of the substrate face and edges after cutting which is impaired by a one side cutting operation. See (Col. 1, Lines 38-44 and Lines 48-67) Brouillette further teaches that entrance cuts are stronger and cleaner than exit cuts. (Col. 6, Lines 15-20) and that strong clean edges are formed with the option of beveled or stepped cuts. Brouillette also teaches that scatter in cutting damage and strength are also diminished for the entrance cuts. Applicant has not addressed these clear advantages which are old and well known in the art of cutting with a saw blade. Nowhere does Brouillette indicate that such advantages would occur only with cuts that completely separate portions of a semiconductor substrate.

Applicant has further argued that Brouillette teaches dicing a substrate which does not relate to forming a slot or other feature through a substrate.

The argument is not persuasive since dicing forms a slot (narrow opening or groove) through a semiconductor substrate. Further, Brouillette is concerned with forming a narrow slot in a semiconductor substrate using a diamond saw blade which is directly relevant to both applicant' s claimed subject matter and the disclosure of Allen.

*P. Hassanzadeh  
primary Examiner  
AU 1763*